

Mullin (Lucas)
Nadler (Jeffries)
Napolitano
(Correa)
Nehls (Fallon)
Payne (Pallone)
Porter (Levin
(CA))
Roybal-Allard
(Escobar)

Ruiz (Aguilar)
Rush
(Underwood)
Sewell (DelBene)
Sherrill
(Pallone)
Sires (Pallone)
Speier (Scanlon)
Strickland
(Kilmer)

Swalwell
(Gallego)
Trahan (Lynch)
Wagner
(Walorski)
Wexton
(Connolly)
Wilson (FL)
(Hayes)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BONAMICI). The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MEEKS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 268, nays 161, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 172]

YEAS—268

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Biggs
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NC)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Boebert
Bonamici
Bourdeaux
Bowman
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brooks
Brown
Brownley
Buck
Burchett
Burgess
Bush
Bustos
Butterfield
Cammack
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cawthorn
Chu
Ciilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Cloud
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Comer
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davidson
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeBene

Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Donalds
Doyle, Michael
F.
Escobar
Eshoo
Españillat
Evans
Feenstra
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel, Lois
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (CA)
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gohmert
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Herrell
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Jordan
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster

Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lynch
Mace
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mann
Manning
Massie
Matsui
McBath
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meijer
Meng
Mfume
Miller (IL)
Mooney
Moore (AL)
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Oberholte
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Pannetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Posey
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley

Raskin
Reed
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Rosendale
Ross
Roy
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schraeder
Schrier
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, David

Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Spartz
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Steel
Steube
Stevens
Stewart
Strickland
Suzuki
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiffany

NAYS—161

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Bilirakis
Bost
Brady
Buchanan
Bucshon
Budd
Calvert
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Clyde
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fortenberry
Foxy
Franklin, C.
Scott
Fulcher
Garbarino
Gibbs
Gimenez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)

Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kinzinger
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luria
Malliotakis
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McKinley
Meuser
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Moolenaar

Moore (UT)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Nehls
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Owens
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Pfluger
Reschenthaler
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rouzer
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Timmons
Turner
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dune
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—2

Green (TN) McHenry

□ 1127

Mr. ISSA changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. McHENRY. Madam Speaker, due to an unavoidable conflict, I was forced to miss votes on June 17, 2021. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 170,

“yea” on rollcall No. 171, and “nay” on rollcall No. 172.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Cárdenas
(Gomez)
Ciilline
(Pingree)
Cleaver (Davids
(KS))
DeSaulnier
(Thompson
(CA))
Frankel, Lois
(Clark (MA))
Gimenez (Waltz)
Gonzalez,
Vicente
(Gomez)
Granger
(Arrington)
Grijalva (Garcia
(IL))
Harshbarger
(Kustoff)
Himes
(Courtney)

Hoyer (Brown)
Johnson (TX)
(Jeffries)
Kahele (Mrvan)
Kim (NJ)
(Pallone)
Kirkpatrick
(Stanton)
Langevin
(Courtney)
Lawson (FL)
(Evans)
Lieu (Raskin)
Lowenthal
(Beyer)
Meng (Clark
(MA))
Mullin (Lucas)
Nadler (Jeffries)
Napolitano
(Correa)
Nehls (Fallon)
Payne (Pallone)

Porter (Levin
(CA))
Roybal-Allard
(Escobar)
Ruiz (Aguilar)
Rush
(Underwood)
Sewell (DelBene)
Sherrill
(Pallone)
Sires (Pallone)
Speier (Scanlon)
Strickland
(Kilmer)
Swalwell
(Gallego)
Trahan (Lynch)
Wagner
(Walorski)
Wexton
(Connolly)
Wilson (FL)
(Hayes)

□ 1130

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO SELECT COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC DISPARITY AND FAIRNESS IN GROWTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 4(g)(1) of House Resolution 8, 117th Congress, and the order of the House of January 4, 2021, of the following Members to the Select Committee on Economic Disparity and Fairness in Growth:

Mr. HIMES, Connecticut, Chair
Ms. KAPTUR, Ohio
Ms. MOORE, Wisconsin
Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ, Texas
Ms. JAYAPAL, Washington
Ms. CRAIG, Minnesota
Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, New York
Ms. JACOBS, California

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. SCALISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the House majority whip the schedule for next week.

Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to yield to my friend from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the majority whip of the House.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman letting me stand in today for the majority leader.

Next week, on Tuesday, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes expected no earlier than 6:30 p.m.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate and 12 p.m. for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business, with last votes no later than 3 p.m.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete

list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

In addition, we will consider:

H.R. 2062, the Protecting Older Workers Against Discrimination Act, which would make it easier for those who have suffered age discrimination in the workplace to file a complaint and seek redress;

H.R. 1443, the LGBTQ Business Equal Credit Enforcement and Investment Act, which would ensure that the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau keep statistics on credit reporting for LGBTQ-owned businesses in the same way as it does for women- and minority-owned companies and small businesses; and

H.R. 239, Equal Access to Contraception for Veterans Act, which would allow women receiving healthcare services from the VA system to access basic contraceptive care without paying copays similar to coverage provided under the Affordable Care Act.

We will consider three resolutions of disapproval to reverse regulatory actions made under the prior administration, which have all been passed by the Senate:

S.J. Res. 13 would reverse the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's rule that had obscured information about the factual and legal basis the Commission used to make determinations on discriminatory practices;

S.J. Res. 14 would overturn the prior administration's Environmental Protection Agency rule that removed protections from dangerous methane emissions that exacerbate the climate crisis; and

S.J. Res. 15 would overturn a rule by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and allow States once again to regulate these lenders and protect consumers in order to rein in predatory lenders and rent-a-bank schemes.

MR. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for walking us through those. Of course, I would first like to, as we note that the majority leader is not here, wish Mr. HOYER a speedy recovery. I got to speak with him yesterday, and he is doing better and appreciates the prayers and thoughts from our colleagues.

And I told him: You don't have to rush back. You want to make sure you get better before you come back.

And I know from experience to take the time and get better. And I offered, by the way, use of my physical therapist, and maybe he and I will do some joint physical therapy when he returns. But he was in good spirits and is looking forward to coming back. I know the gentleman from South Carolina shares that as well.

MR. CLYBURN. Absolutely.

MR. SCALISE. I am sure the gentleman from Maryland is watching right now as he is recovering, but I said, we are used to sparring and having some fun conversations back and forth through the Select Subcommittee

on the Coronavirus, but we also look forward to seeing him back in the middle of this fray soon, too.

If I may, I did want to ask. There were a couple of bills that deal with the origin of the coronavirus, and I know we have been having those conversations about trying to get a deeper investigation into the origin of the coronavirus. But the Senate had passed over a few weeks ago a bill, S. 1867, that came out of the Senate unanimously back in May, which requires the Director of National Intelligence to declassify information that relates to the origin of COVID-19.

I am not sure if this is a bill that you all were looking at bringing up, but we wanted to just ask if we could have S. 1867 brought to the House floor. It was a bill that passed unanimously out of the Senate, which does indicate that there was strong interest on both sides to get that information declassified so we can get more information about the origin of COVID for all of our Members to be able to see, not just those Members that have access to that information.

I am not sure, again, if the gentleman was looking at that, but if that is something you all could look at, I think it would be well received by both sides, and then would help us quickly get that information available for all to see.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

MR. CLYBURN. You and I have been having this discussion for quite a while with our select subcommittee activities. I have not seen the legislation that you make reference to, but I am sure that the majority leader has. And, like you, I am looking forward to his speedy recovery so he can get back into this spot. I am a little more familiar with sparring with you in our select subcommittee than on this floor.

But having said that, I think you are aware that the Biden administration has already directed the United States intelligence community to examine this issue, calling on the intelligence community to redouble their efforts to report their findings by August 24 and to keep Congress fully apprised of their work.

We have confidence in their ability to conduct a robust evidence-based inquiry into the origin of the coronavirus and will not allow House Republicans to irresponsibly hijack this issue for partisan purposes. We want to see this thing happen, and you and I have had this discussion. And because they have got until August 24—that is, what, 3 months from now, or less—I think we will be in a good place to let the Intelligence Committee do its work.

MR. SCALISE. There is an old adage: "Why put off tomorrow what you can do today?"

There is unanimous support for S. 1867 to not wait until August. And, in fact, it was May when Senators—all Republicans and all Democrat Senators—recognized that this is some-

thing we should do and we should do now, and this would get more information out to the public, as well as to our Members.

I would also ask if the majority would look at H. Res. 90, which is a resolution that supports the international investigation into the origin of COVID-19.

There are many countries. We have heard a lot of European countries have expressed interest in having an international commission to look into this. I don't know why the United States would be reluctant to be a part of that investigation.

But, again, in light of all of the new information that has come out, some emails recently since our committee has met, show more and more that there is a high likelihood that COVID-19 started in the Wuhan lab. Whether it was intentional or not, there is strong evidence pointing to the fact that it likely started there.

We have not had a single hearing, not any of the standing committees, and here we have a committee that, by its name, the Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus was established for the purpose of investigating COVID-19, all elements of it, not just what is happening here in America.

We just recognized over 600,000 deaths from COVID-19 on the steps of the Capitol just a few days ago. So, clearly, it has hit our country hard, but it has hit the whole world hard. Millions of people have died. And now there is real evidence that has come out, including from some of our own scientists here in America, that they may have been aware over a year ago that COVID-19 originated in the lab as opposed to what the original projections were that it was a bat-to-human transmission. Now there is a lot of evidence pointing to the opposite of that.

In fact, many of us were calling for that investigation over a year ago, and some were called conspiracy theorists, yet now the hard scientific data shows that it may have been, in fact, started in that lab.

Why are we not having those hearings now in our committee, other committees, again, not months from now?

But if China knew of this, there may not be scientists that we can get access to, but we have American scientists who were in communication with those scientists. Whether it is directly or indirectly, there may have been taxpayer funds that were involved in that. We should be trying to find that out now. And China may be trying to cover some of that up.

The quicker we can get those hearings and those investigations, the more we can find out while it is still possible to find it out. I think it would help a lot of us to understand what really happened, what went wrong.

Because if it was started in that lab, this would be a disaster dramatically greater than Chernobyl in terms of devastation to the world, loss of human life. We should all want to be finding

out. There were a lot of investigations into Chernobyl. This is dramatically worse than Chernobyl. And if it was self-made, that is something we should be investigating now. I am not sure why there is a reluctance to do it.

But I would ask the gentleman, if I could just reiterate, I know we sent a letter—over 200 of our colleagues signed on—asking that we investigate it, all the committees of jurisdiction, including ours.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I want to assure the gentleman that I am as anxious to know exactly what happened as he is. And the American people want to know exactly what happened. The fact of the matter is, though, we have several committees that are investigating, including the House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology have indicated that they intend to look into the matter.

Now, like you, I am from the South, and you can get too many cooks in the kitchen. And I am fully aware that to have a plethora of committees stumbling over each other trying to get to the bottom of this will serve no useful purpose.

So I want to see things done here as close to regular order as we possibly can have them done, and to let the committees of jurisdiction conduct their investigation, this administration working through its intelligence department doing the investigations, and I am sure they will come up with the kind of information that would do us as citizens and as Members of this great body justice.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, we will continue to press for that investigation.

And, you know, I am from New Orleans, and I know what it is like to have cooks in the kitchen, but I also know how important it is to have a lot of eyes looking at the same thing. And the more eyes looking into something where there is mystery, where there is uncertainty, where there is speculation, I think the more people looking at this, the better.

Again, our committee is uniquely set up. There are other committees that are set up to look at different aspects of it. We should all be looking at it because the more questions we ask—it seems like right now more questions are raised. We need to get answers to those questions, and we get those answers by having that oversight hearing. We don't want some kind of Soviet-style coverup. We want to be looking at those questions and having people brought in.

There are American scientists, some people who work for this United States Government, who could help us answer those questions, and they haven't been brought forward. We can compel them to come forward, especially in light of these emails that have come out recently, which show that some of those scientists were aware over a year ago that it may have started in the lab.

□ 1145

That was not shared with us in previous hearings. I think a lot of our Members on both sides would like to find that information out as much as we can. And the more we are asking questions, the more I think we will get answers that everybody in the country and around the world wants to know. So, we will continue to press for that.

I also want to ask about the appropriations process. I understand the Committee on Appropriations is starting to do some work to start bringing up the bills in committee so that we can, hopefully, have an appropriations process move forward. We would be strongly encouraging a bipartisan appropriations process but also an open appropriations process.

So, as we look to the floor schedule, we are hearing that maybe in July some of these bills would come to the floor. As the gentleman knows, when we bring appropriations bills to the floor, whether it is a fully open process or even a modified process, you typically have well over 100 amendments that come to the floor on these appropriations bills.

Does the gentleman anticipate that we would start, around July, seeing some of those bills come to the floor? And will we have that ability on the floor to have those kinds of amendments brought forward in a process that we have seen in the past?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The Committee on Appropriations has announced that it will start its process next week with four subcommittee markups. Over the next 2 weeks, and then the week of July 12, the committee will complete subcommittee and full committee markups on all 12 of the annual appropriations bills.

We plan to consider the bills on the floor the final 2 weeks of July, when we are in session. That will be the week of July 19 and July 26.

Now, I suspect that we will be close to what the gentleman just indicated he would like to see with the schedule. I am certain that the Committee on Appropriations will do everything it possibly can to keep that schedule so that we will complete all of our work before the August break.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and we look forward to that robust process through both committee and, ultimately, on the floor.

The last point, I wanted to ask about deals with infrastructure. We are seeing a lot of different groups both in the House and Senate that are working on various infrastructure plans. I know we had Members on our side, Ranking Member GRAVES and others, who rolled out a plan recently that covers traditional infrastructure, which would be roads and bridges—even broadband, waterways—paid for along the way, not with tax increases but with responsible budgeting.

I wanted to ask because we are hearing different reports on what may or may not come to the House floor. Budget reconciliation, possibly, and tax increases, unfortunately, are still being floated out there, which is different from what we are hearing right now with the bipartisan Senate plan.

Can the gentleman shed light on what is anticipated on the floor, whether it would be a budget reconciliation bill in the weeks or months ahead or maybe a bipartisan plan, which we would surely encourage, laying out some ideas of infrastructure that would be bipartisan that we would support?

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman could answer that, I would be happy to yield.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I think the gentleman is aware that I am very anxious about doing things in a bipartisan way when that can be achieved.

Now, the majority leader has announced that during the week of June 28, the House will take up the INVEST in America Act, a 5-year surface transportation reauthorization bill that was approved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure by a bipartisan vote.

I think the gentleman is aware of the pretty long session, all-night session, that both parties in that committee undertook. I think that they have produced a product that will make these key investments in smart, safe, sustainable, and resilient transportation infrastructure that is needed by the American people to move goods and services throughout our country efficiently, effectively, and equitably. I could not go through this colloquy with the gentleman and not invoke those three words that he is so familiar with.

Now, at the same time, we must remember that our Nation's infrastructure is comprised of far more than roads and bridges. I often talk about the advent of the internet. I could remember when it first came on the scene, everybody referred to the internet as the "information superhighway." I have always advocated that it is time for us to start treating the information highway the same way we treat the interstate highways.

So, I agree with the gentleman that we should move with an infrastructure bill, but I want him to know that I think it is important that the Accessible, Affordable Internet for All Act is a part of that.

I know this debate has been going on as to whether or not we ought to move on a bipartisan bill that focuses on traditional infrastructure. For anything to be traditional, it has to be in our past, but I think it is time for us to be looking to the future when we talk about infrastructure and to have an infrastructure bill come through this body that focuses on the future of healthcare, which cannot be efficient, effective, or equitable without broadband.

Online learning is a must for our children. We know COVID-19, according to all the experts, may not be the last time that we are faced with such a pandemic. There are some predicting that there could come another, maybe not in my lifetime but maybe in yours. We must be prepared.

So, I am hopeful that this infrastructure bill that we move through this body will not just be traditional but will be looking to the future so we can have the kind of legislation that will prepare our children and grandchildren for a world that we hope they will be competitive in.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. Hopefully, we can have that debate and work together to achieve that vision for the future as we are dealing with the problems of today and our infrastructure needs for today, but also do it in a fiscally responsible way. I think that is what the two sides, especially in the Senate, are looking at.

I still haven't gotten an indication, specifically, as it deals with some kind of reconciliation bill that may or may not come to the floor. Hopefully, it is not some attempt to raise taxes and do things that would undermine our economy, our competitiveness, and our ability to create more opportunities for people to achieve the American Dream by entering into the workforce and ultimately moving their way up and having their own opportunities as well, which would be undermined with higher taxes.

If that part of the equation gets brought in, clearly, that changes the dynamic. But, hopefully, we stick to the traditional infrastructure needs that you and I would both agree need to be met. Hopefully, we can find a path to get there together. That is what we will be working toward in the week ahead.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman has nothing else, I am prepared to yield back.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I don't have anything else. I thank the gentleman for allowing me to stand in here today.

I say to him that I would hope that as we go forward with this discussion, we will look at this whole issue as the title of the bill indicates: Invest in America. When we make investments, financial investments, the money may leave our coffers, but it comes back sometimes tenfold.

So there is a big difference between raising taxes and making investments.

Mr. SCALISE. Hopefully, we can keep that difference in mind.

I appreciate the gentleman filling in, and we will see the gentleman from Maryland back soon enough and maybe even moving a little faster than before. I am not going to challenge him to a race because he would defeat me in that.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from South Carolina, and I yield back the balance of my time.

RECOMMITTING ON JUNETEENTH

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on June 19, 1865, freedom finally came for the last enslaved African Americans in the United States when Union soldiers arrived in Galveston, Texas, more than 2 years after President Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation.

Today, 156 years later, President Biden will be signing a law to make Juneteenth a new Federal holiday. It is a cause for celebration. It should also serve as an occasion for learning and for this country to reflect on our history and recommit to doing the vital work to ensure that the lasting effects of slavery, bigotry, and racism are replaced with hope, dignity, and equality for all.

We can start with the Senate passing the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act, legislation to reform policing and address systemic racism and bias within law enforcement, and finally making the John Lewis Voting Rights Act a law, passing it.

Today, we celebrate this historic designation of Juneteenth as a Federal holiday. Tomorrow, we get back to work.

BIDEN INFLATION

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the hidden tax that is plaguing hardworking Americans. This hidden tax is inflation.

Under President Biden, we have seen the largest spike in 13 years, with consumer prices surging 5 percent in May. Core inflation rose at its fastest pace since 1992.

American families are being forced to pay more for the products that they need. Gasoline is 56.2 percent more expensive today than 12 months ago. Transportation services have increased 11.2 percent. Together, food and energy prices have increased 3.8 percent. Even used cars and truck prices have increased 29.7 percent.

Yet, Democrats rammed through a trillion-dollar package that is crushing small businesses and hurting hardworking American families by incentivizing Americans to stay at home and not get back to work. We are currently down 7.6 million jobs from our pre-pandemic levels. Our inflation is rising because of President Biden's far-left tax-and-spend proposals.

Americans cannot afford the Biden inflation tax. We know wasteful government spending will not solve this crisis, no matter how many times President Biden and the Democrats propose it.

HONORING THE LIFE OF ANITA EHLERS

(Mr. CASTEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CASTEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of Anita Ehlers, a constituent member of the Barrington, Illinois, community I represent and, more importantly, a friend.

I never knew Anita when she didn't have cancer. But for a long time, I didn't know that she did. She just never let it define who she was.

I knew her as a wonderfully kind, hardworking woman who was committed to making the world a better place.

Our Speaker often reminds us: "We don't agonize. We organize." Every time she says it, I see Anita's face in my head.

I never saw her feel sorry for herself. Every time I was with her, it seemed like all the thoughts in her head were on how to make the world a little better for everybody else: her husband, Gregg; her daughters, Julia and Lindsay; her friends and neighbors; me and all the folks she was motivating.

As a women's marcher, a climate protector, an ally for the LBGT community, a universal health coverage champion, a union member, a teacher, and a lung cancer support advocate, she never agonized. She organized.

The world, and our district, is a sadder place without her. But I take inspiration because she always made our community a better place.

May we all find the strength to follow her example, to make the world around us a little easier for everybody else, no matter the adversity that we may personally face.

1200

PREPARATIONS TO EVACUATE AFGHAN INTERPRETERS

(Mr. MEIJER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MEIJER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the dire situation of our interpreters in Afghanistan, where we are over halfway through our planned withdrawal. Meanwhile, almost 20,000 Afghans who worked with U.S. forces are anxiously awaiting special immigrant visa approval, a process that can take years. Making matters worse, our Kabul Embassy suspended visa operations last week due to a surge in COVID cases.

Mr. Speaker, President Biden must immediately start preparations to evacuate those Afghans to Guam to safely await visa approval. My colleagues and I on the Honoring our Promises Working Group urged the administration to do so 2 weeks ago, but we have yet to hear back. This is unacceptable.

President Biden ended the remain in Mexico for economic migrants but insists on a remain in Afghanistan policy